1

Detecting microbial engraftment after FMT: sorting signals from noise using placebo sequencing and culture-enriched metagenomics

4
5

6 Shahrokh Shekarriz[1,2], Jake C. Szamosi[1,2], Fiona J. Whelan[3], Jennifer T. Lau[2], Josie Libertucci[2], Laura Rossi[2,4], Michelle E. Fontes[1,2], Melanie Wolfe[2], Christine H. Lee[5], Paul Moayyedi[1,2], and Michael G. Surette[1,2,4]

9
10 [1]Department of Medicine, McMaster University
11 [2]Farncombe Family Digestive Health Research Institute McMaster University
12 [3]School of Biological Sciences, University of Manchester
13 [4]Department of Biochemistry and Biomedical Sciences, McMaster University
14 [5]Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, The University of British Columbia

15
16

ABSTRACT

Fecal microbiota transplantation (FMT) has shown efficacy for the treatment of ulcerative colitis
but with variable response between patients and trials. The mechanisms underlying FMT's
therapeutic effects remains poorly understood but is generally assumed to involve engraftment
of donor microbiota into the recipient's microbiome. Previous studies have reported microbial
engraftment following FMT in various disease contexts but with inconsistent results between
studies. Here we investigate engraftment in UC patients receiving FMT from a single donor
applying amplicon-based profiling, shotgun metagenomics and culture-enriched metagenomics.
Placebo samples were included to estimate engraftment noise, and a significant level of false-
positive engraftment was observed which confounds the prediction of true engraftment. We
show that analyzing engraftment across multiple patients from a single donor enhances the
accuracy of detection. We identified a unique set of genes engrafted in responders to FMT which
supports strain displacement as the primary mechanism of engraftment in our cohort.

Ulcerative colitis (UC) is a type of inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) of unknown etiology that is

restricted to the colon[1]. UC is believed to arise from a disruption in the balance between the

immune system and microbiota in a genetically susceptible individual[2]. Current standard medical

treatments have focused on supressing the immune response and are not always effective at

controlling disease[4]. An alternative approach is to alter the microbial environment responsible

for driving the immune response[5]. Fecal microbiota transplantation (FMT) has emerged as an

increasingly popular approach to alter the colonic microbiota[6] and is a standard therapy for

patients with recurrent *Clostridioides difficile* infection (rCDI)[7,8] and has also been evaluated in

UC[9–12].

We reported the first randomized controlled trial (RCT) of FMT for patients with active UC[5]. This

RCT showed that the proportion of patients with active UC in which remission was induced after

FMT (24%) was significantly higher than a placebo group (5%), with no difference in adverse

events. This has been replicated by other researchers and a systematic review of 12 RCTs suggests

there is moderate quality evidence that FMT can induce remission in active UC[13]. One of the

donors involved in our trial was more successful at inducing remission than other donors, with 7

of the 9 responders receiving Donor B stool[5]. This apparent donor effect can only be studied in

trials where each patient receives all their FMT from a single donor and most studies do not give

FMT in this way. Our RCT did use single donors for each participant with only a small pool of

donors overall[5]. We were therefore positioned to study donor effects, and we are building on

our previous work by further investigating the microbial composition of patients who received

FMT from Donor B compared to those who received placebo treatments to ask whether a specific

group of microbes were engrafted following FMT, and to determine whether microbial

engraftment is associated with remission after FMT.

Previous studies have reported microbial engraftment—the transfer of microbes from donor to

patients—following FMT in various disease contexts, particularly in rCDI[14–18]. However, there are

inconsistent results between studies. Even larger studies, which applied their bioinformatic

workflows to multiple publicly available datasets and disease types[19–21], reported disparate

outcomes. To our knowledge, none of these studies have applied their analytical pipelines to

placebo samples from RCTs sequenced with a metagenomic approach to assess background noise

or establish thresholds for engraftment detection. Moreover, culture-independent approaches

often lack the sensitivity to detect low-abundance bacteria. Culture-enriched sequencing

methods provide a more comprehensive view of the human microbiome than culture-

independent sequencing, particularly for low-abundance bacteria, and past studies have shown

the utility of this approach in capturing the diversity of intestinal[22,23], lung[24,25], skin[26], and urine[27]

human microbiota.

To answer the question of whether specific groups of microbes are responsible for inducing

remission in UC, we have therefore used three high-throughput sequencing approaches; culture-

independent (direct) 16S rRNA gene amplicon sequencing, culture-independent (direct) shotgun

metagenomic sequencing (DMG), and culture-enriched shotgun metagenomic sequencing

(CEMG). Further, we asked whether observed engraftment truly reflected the donor

microbiome's influence, or if it was an artefact of low sampling resolution. To address this, we

used a unique dataset, containing stool samples from patients receiving FMT from a single donor

and those procured from patients undergoing placebo treatments. This multifaceted approach

enables us to provide insights into the microbiome's potential role in UC remission.

Results

79
80
Our RCT involved 70 patients, with 36 undergoing FMT and 34 receiving a placebo[5]. At the trial's

conclusion, 9 patients in the FMT group (7 from Donor B) and 2 in the placebo group had entered

remission **(Figure 1A)**. For an accurate assessment of true microbial engraftment from Donor B,

we revisited the 16S rRNA gene amplicon sequencing data with enhanced resolution by using

amplicon sequence variants (ASV)[28] instead of operational taxonomic units (OTUs). This

reanalysis involved paired pre- and post-treatment samples from 20 FMT recipients of Donor B's

stool, and 31 placebo recipients **(Figure 1B).** We selected all available responders and an equal

number non-responders from the Donor B FMT group (6 per group) and both responders and 10

non-responders (chosen at random) from the placebo groups for shotgun metagenomics.

Additionally, shotgun metagenomic sequencing was applied to four longitudinal samples from

Donor B **(Figure 1C)**. We built a comprehensive sequence library of Donor B's samples via culture-

enriched metagenomic sequencing, assembly, and annotations previously described[25] **(Figure**

1D, see Supplementary Results**, Supp Figure 2).**

Microbial engraftment is present after FMT against a background of false positives.

We have previously shown that culture-independent methods often underestimate microbial

diversity in a stool sample compared to culture-enriched approaches[22]. If strains shared between

patient and donor below the detection limit of the culture-independent method in the patient

but are detected post-FMT they would appear as engrafted but are false-positives (spurious

engraftment). Here we compare measurements of engraftment in FMT recipients from a single

donor and placebo recipients to estimate the extent of spurious engraftment at different

sequencing resolutions, including at the ASV, species (as identified by MetaPhlAn4[29]), and strain

levels (as identified by StrainPhlAn4[29]).

105
106
Figure 1. **Diagram of study design**. **A.** The double-blind randomized control trial of FMT for UC patients [5]. **B.** Direct 16S rRNA
gene amplicon sequencing of stool was conducted for all patients and Donor B samples. Note that no baseline sample was
available for one of the Donor B responders and this subject was excluded from our analysis. **C** Shotgun metagenomic sequencing
was carried out for a subset of patients who received FMT from Donor B. 6 responders and 6 non-responders and an equivalent
number of placebo treated patients. **D.** The culture-enriched metagenomics workflow to build a comprehensive sequence
database of Donor B's gut microbiome. FMT = fecal microbiome transplant; PLCA = plate coverage algorithm.

We hypothesized that spurious engraftment in the placebo group would be minimal, and that

significant microbial engraftment would correlate with clinical remission after FMT. To

investigate this, we utilized samples from Donor B in both 16S rRNA and shotgun metagenomics

sequencing datasets, establishing a stringent cut-off to define apparent microbial engraftment.

A microbe was only described as engrafted if its relative abundance was zero prior to FMT and

rose above our established cut-off after FMT (detailed in Methods, **Supp Figure 1**).

Initially, we investigated whether a clear difference exists between rates of apparent
engraftment in the FMT and placebo groups. Our dataset, involving a single donor, allowed us to
identify features that were apparently engrafted in multiple patients. We hypothesize that
engraftments observed in multiple individuals are more likely to be the result of true microbial
colonization and less reflective of individual-specific microbial changes during FMT. We identified
ASVs, species, and strains that appeared to be engrafted in a given numbers of patients ranging
from one, two, three, etc. from both FMT and placebo groups **(Figure 2 A1, B1, and C1)**. We then
computed the differences in numbers of each type of engraftment event for each dataset (donor
vs placebo) and used permutation tests to determine whether the amount of apparent
engraftment observed in patients who received FMT was significantly different from the amount
observed in placebo (see Methods). The results showed that the FMT group had a significantly
higher number of apparent engraftments than the placebo group (p-values presented in **Figure**
2 for each dataset), highlighting the likelihood that FMT leads to (at least some) true engraftment.
However, a high number of spurious engraftments were also observed in the placebo group at
ASV, species, and strain levels, even with our stringent cut-off, suggesting considerable noise in
microbial engraftment detection.
137
Next, we identified apparently engrafted ASVs, species, and strains that were unique to either
the FMT or placebo groups, or shared between them ("overlap"), as shown in **Figure 2 A2**, **B2**,
and **C2**. The shotgun metagenomic dataset contained a stronger signal than the 16S dataset,
showing that a higher proportion of apparently engrafted features are unique to the FMT group.
More interestingly, the number of apparent engraftments in three or more patients in the
unique-to-placebo group – which was smaller than in the unique-to-FMT group across species,
strain, and 16S data - showed a stronger signal in species- and strain-level analysis. This indicates
that our approach of looking for features that appear to engraft in multiple patients reduces the
risk of spurious detection of engraftment. The number of apparently engrafted features that
were observed in both FMT and placebo groups underscores the importance of including placebo
sequencing in studies, and reflects the fact that common microbial changes in individuals over
time can mimic an engraftment signal.

Last, we explored whether microbial engraftment is associated with the response to FMT

treatment. We compared the number of apparently engrafted features in responder and non-

responder patients in the FMT group across ASV, species, and strain-level datasets **(Figure 2 A3,**

B3, C3). The 16S dataset included 14 non-responders and 6 responders, while the shotgun

metagenomic datasets included the same 6 responders and a sub-set of non-responders (n=6).

Similar to the placebo vs. FMT comparisons described above, we calculated the differences in the

number of engrafted features and weighted engraftment statistics (see Methods) and used

permutation tests to compare the two groups. The results indicated no clear difference in the

number of apparent engraftments between responders and non-responders. Numbers of

apparently engrafted features can be found in **Supplementary Table 2** and **3**.

161
162

163
164

Figure 2. **Comparison of rates of apparent engraftment between groups**. Detection of apparently engrafted ASVs from 16S rRNA
gene sequencing (A), species from shotgun metagenomic sequencing (B) and strains from shotgun metagenomic sequencing (C).
Row 1: Comparison of the number of apparently engrafted features observed in FMT vs. placebo samples. The x-axis shows the
number of patients a feature is apparently engrafted present in, and the y-axis shows the number of features observed to be
apparently engrafted in exactly that many patients within FMT (green) or placebo (grey) samples. Row 2: Counting the number
of apparently engrafted features that are unique to FMT samples (green), placebo samples (grey), or present in both (orange).
The x-axis shows the number of patients a feature is apparently engrafted in, and the y-axis shows the number of features
observed apparently engrafted in exactly that many patients. Row 3: The number of apparently engrafted features in FMT
samples that are present in patients who responded to FMT treatment (blue lines) and did not respond (red lines). The differences
between the points on the green and grey (row 1) or blue and red (row 3) lines were used to calculate the test statistics for the
permutation tests.

High resolution mapping of patient reads to Donor B MAGs to detect apparent genome engraftment.

The results above indicate that detection of microbial engraftment may require greater microbial

resolution than amplicon-based or read-based shotgun metagenomic sequencing. We

hypothesized that co-assembling sequences from direct and culture-enriched metagenomic

sequencing (CEMG) of the Donor B microbiota would improve gene and metagenome assembled

genome (MAG) recovery from this donor compared to the commonly used direct metagenomic

(DMG) approach. To generate the highest possible resolution assembly of Donor B's microbiota,

we built a comprehensive database using a co-assembly of four longitudinal DMG samples as well

as our single CEMG sample (see Supplementary Results, **Supp Figure 2**). We focused on 209 MAGs

out of a total of 447 bins in our databases**.** To track the engraftment of these MAGs after FMT,

we mapped raw shotgun reads — subsampled to uniform sequencing depth — from the pre- and

post-treatment samples of 24 patients (12 FMT recipients and 12 placebo-treated individuals, 48

samples in total) to these 209 MAGs.

To define the thresholds for MAG engraftment, we mapped raw sequence reads from our four

Donor B samples to the Donor B MAG database (BDB). In each sample, we observed bimodal

distribution in MAG coverage, with the modes at the extremities of the distribution. We reasoned

that MAGs that were present in that sample were the ones that appeared in the upper mode,

where at least 75% of the length of the MAG was covered at least 1x, and the MAGS that were

absent from that sample were those that appeared in the lower mode, where no more than 20%

of the length of the MAG was covered at least 1x. We therefore set these coverage values as our

cutoffs for presence and absence, respectively (**Supp Figure 1**).

We assessed the number of apparently engrafted MAGs in FMT recipients compared to placebo

recipients, using methods similar to those in the read-based metagenomic analyses described

above. Our goal was to determine if assembly-based assessments would reveal clear differences

between the FMT and placebo groups. Consistent with previous results, we found a significant

increase in the number of MAGs apparently engrafted in any given number of patients in the FMT

group compared to placebo (**Figure 3A1**, permutation test p=0.008). We observed no significant

differences in the numbers of engrafted MAGS, or the numbers of patients per engrafted MAG,

when comparing FMT responders to non-responders (**Figure 3A3**, permutation test p=0.24).

Upon examining MAGs engrafted in one or more individuals, we found that 57% of engrafted

MAGs (42 out of 74) were unique to patients who received and responded to FMT (**Figure 3B**),

specifically patients 4, 10, and 56. *Lachnospiraceae*, *Ruminococcaceae*, and *Oscillospiraceae* were

the most abundant families among these MAGs (**Figure 3C**). These findings suggest that microbial

genomic alterations in response to FMT are individual-specific, and that a degree of spurious

engraftment is observable in the placebo group, indicating that even genome-resolved

metagenomic approaches to detect engraftment are also prone to false positives.

Figure 3. **High resolution genome-resolved metagenomics reveals apparent microbial genome engraftment following FMT**. **A1.**
Comparison of apparently engrafted MAGs in patients who received FMT (n=12) vs. placebo (n=12) treatment. The x-axis displays
number of patients in which a given MAG appears engrafted. **A2.** Counts of MAGs engrafted in only FMT (green), only Placebo
(grey), and both (orange). **A3.** MAGs engrafted in FMT patients, observed in responders (n=6, blue) and non-responders (n=6,
red). The differences between the points on the green and grey (A1) or blue and red (A3) lines were used to calculate the test
statistics for the permutation tests. **B.** All donor MAGs engrafted in at least one patient. Green represents MAGs exclusively
engrafted in FMT recipients, grey indicates MAGs spuriously detected as engrafted in the Placebo group, and orange signifies
MAGs detected in both FMT and Placebo treatment cohorts. MAGs are ordered on the x axis by which group(s) of patients they
were apparently engrafted in. **C.** The family-taxonomy of donor MAGs engrafted in at least one patient.

A signature of gene engraftment in patients who responded to FMT.

Although our approach allowed us to refine 209 MAGs from a single FMT donor, tracking MAGs

omits information from the majority of assembled reads, which are in bins or contigs that are

excluded from MAGs. In strains or species that are closely related, for instance, the presence or

absence of a few genes can lead to distinct functional profiles[30,31]. Therefore, detecting strain

replacement events following FMT requires analysis of bacterial genes. Furthermore, MAGs do

not usually represent complete genomes[32]. This complexity is further evidenced by the Donor B

MAGs, where we found that 20% of donor MAGs had 1x read coverage in post-FMT samples over

20-75% of their genome , and could therefore not be determined to be definitively present or

absent in any patient samples **(Supp Figure 1)**

We aimed to identify genes linked with engraftment and response to FMT. Using all Donor B

contigs >2.5kb long, we identified a total of 755,662 genes. We then mapped raw reads from all

the patient samples (n=48), to the Donor B gene database. We define apparently engrafted genes

as those with ≤ 1x coverage over less than 25% of their length in the baseline sample, and ≥ 1x

coverage over 90% or more of their length after treatment.

We employed the same methodology used in 16S, read-based metagenomics, and MAG analysis

to assess engraftment in the FMT and placebo groups, to again identify the rate of spurious

engraftment. Our results revealed a significant difference in the number of apparently engrafted

genes between patients treated with FMT and those receiving placebo (**Figure 4A1**, permutation

test p=0.001). Consistent with all previous analyses, the number of apparently engrafted genes

unique to the placebo group decreased as we restricted the count to genes apparently engrafted

in increasing numbers of patients (**Figure 4A2**). Consistent with other datasets, we could not

clearly see a difference in the number of engrafted genes between responders and non-

responders within the FMT group (**Figure 4A3,** permutation test p=0.86).

To enrich for legitimate engraftment events, we focused on genes engrafted in three or more patients. This provided a set of 45,419 genes. Among these, 56.9% (25,826) were engrafted in FMT recipients and also present in at least one placebo recipient. Notably, 37.9% (17,230) were exclusive to FMT recipients, while only 5.2% (2,363) were unique to the placebo group. This final category, since it is known to be false positives, was not subject to further analysis. Genes unique to responders represented 3.3% (1,488), compared to only 0.6% (283) in non-responders (**Figure 4B**). To trace the origins of genes uniquely associated with FMT responders, we examined their presence in contigs grouped in MAGs and non-MAG bins. We found 620 genes within 55 unique

287 MAGs, 535 in contigs not assigned to any bin ("UnBin"), and 333 in 32 non-MAG bins (**Figure 4C**).

288 These findings highlight the importance of our gene-based approach. Relying solely on genome

289 detection strategies using MAGs would have prevented the identification of most of these genes.

290
291

292
293
Figure 5.**Commonly engrafted genes in FMT responders are strain-specific and depleted in IBD patients. A.** We searched for
genes commonly apparently engrafted in FMT responders in the RefSeq complete bacterial genomes (n=33,167) database. The
number of observed engrafted genes per genome is represented by green bars on the x-axis, while strains with at least 5 engrafted
genes are displayed on the y-axis. Bacterial strains are grouped and color-coded on the y-axis according to their family. **B.** To
demonstrate the specificity of these genes within a genus, unique engrafted genes are represented on the x-axis and compared
across the genomes depicted on the y-axis (shared with panel A). **C.** Comparison of the number of genes commonly engrafted in
responders that were found in healthy individuals (n=56) and patients with UC (n=76) and CD (n=CD). We utilized metagenomic
reads from a publicly available dataset (PRJNA40007229[33]) that includes samples from healthy donors and IBD patients to explore
the association of these genes with health status. **D.** Comparison of the relative abundance of these commonly engrafted genes
within the same cohort as panel C.

Characterizing a strain collection with commonly engrafted genes depleted in IBD patients.

To further investigate the 1,488 genes engrafted in at least 3 responders, we searched for these genes in 33,167 RefSeq genomes from all bacterial phyla, updated as of May 2023. Our objective was to ascertain whether these genes are widely distributed across various taxa, or are specific to certain strains.

Our analysis revealed that 66 out of the 33,167 genomes contained the genes of interest, each with more than five genes per genome. These genomes were distributed across six bacterial families (**Figure 5A**). Notably, genes identified in the families *Bacteroidaceae* were present in multiple species within their genera, suggesting these were widely shared between strains within the *Bacteroides* genus. By contrast, genes present in *Lachnospiraceae* and *Ruminococcaceae*, were more strain-specific within a species. The remaining families contained 11% of the detected genes. (**Figure 5B**).

Among the 1,488 genes identified, 1,415 were annotated as coding sequences (CDS) with a median length of 491 bp. Of these, 845 proteins were previously characterized or had predicted function by homology, while the remaining were hypothetical proteins with no predicted function. Among the characterized proteins, 593 were distributed across 19 diverse Clusters of Orthologous Groups (COG) categories. The most prevalent categories included Transcription, which accounted for 12.8% of these proteins, followed by Replication, Recombination, and Repair (12.3%), and Carbohydrate Transport and Metabolism (8%).

One notable observation (**Supp Figure 3**) is that for any individual only a small portion of the microbiome features are shared between patient and donor. However, most of the donor's microbiome features are shared with at least one subject. This is also true of engrafted features. This reflects the high individual variability in human gut microbiomes.

Expanding our investigation, we utilized a larger dataset of publicly available metagenomic samples (PRJNA40007229[33]), which included healthy individuals (n=56), UC patients (n=76), and

patients with Crohn's disease (CD) (n=88). We mapped these reads to the 1,488 genes to

determine their presence and relative abundance in the samples. Intriguingly, we found a notable

reduction in both the number and relative abundance of these genes in IBD patients compared

to healthy individuals. (Tukey test, p-values in **Figure 5C and 5D**, overall ANOVA p-values

<0.0001). These observations, derived from an independent and more extensive dataset, further

underscore the potential significance of these genes in the context of IBD.

Discussion

FMT has emerged as a promising therapeutic option for UC, demonstrating efficacy in RCTs when

compared to placebo[13,34]. However, the variability in patient response remains a critical

challenge, underscoring the need to elucidate the factors influencing the success of FMT. Donor

microbiota composition has been implicated in treatment outcomes, with studies reporting both

donor-dependent efficacy and the benefits of pooling microbiomes from multiple donors[5,18,35].

In this study, we aimed to dissect the mechanisms underlying successful FMT by examining

microbial engraftment in UC patients. We examined the rates of apparent engraftment in both

FMT and placebo groups. We observe a significant level of spurious engraftment (false-positives)

in the placebo group which confounds the prediction of true engraftment. Additionally, our data

suggest that analyzing engraftment across multiple patients from a single donor enhances the

accuracy of detection. Finally, we applied a gene-based strategy for engraftment analysis, which

addresses several limitations inherent in read-based and MAG focused approaches, offering a

refined approach to understanding and improving FMT outcomes.

Our analysis also underscores the necessity of integrating placebo group sequencing in

investigation of post-FMT engraftment. Our data from the placebo controls demonstrated that a

substantial amount of false positives detection occurs, and caution must be taken when

interpreting results. These false-positives arise because donor features in a patient (e.g.

species/strains/MAGs/genes) may be present at baseline but below the level of detection. If

these features increase and are detected at a second timepoint, then they will appear to be

engrafted. By refining engraftment thresholds and employing rigorous controls, we aim to

provide a clearer and more reliable framework for interpreting FMT outcomes in UC.

The application of MAGs in studying microbial engraftment after FMT presents significant

challenges. The inherent difficulties in accurately assembling MAGs from complex microbial

communities result in the exclusion of a substantial portion of sequencing data. The non-MAG

metagenomic data will include species present at lower abundance, plasmids, mobile genetic

elements, and when multiple strains of a species are present - strain-specific genes. Using the

define thresholds for donor MAG presence and absence in subjects, we observed 4 MAGs

predicted to be engrafted in at least three FMT recipients, but only one of these, a

Lachnospiraceae, was shared between 3 responders (*Hominisplanchenecus faecis*).

The clearest signals of engraftment in our study came from the gene dataset where specific sets

of donor genes were predicted to be engrafted and associated with response in multiple FMT

recipients. The gene-level analysis is consistent with most engraftment events being associated

with strain displacement where a donor strain replaces a recipient strain of the same species.

Here we use strain in the context of the presence and absence of accessory genes which focuses

on functional differences between strains. Strains can be defined by single nucleotide

polymorphisms in core genes (e.g. StrainPhlAn) which is a powerful approach for evolutionary

studies but does not directly identify functional differences between strains. Approximately 60%

of these genes were not found in MAGs even though our culture-enriched metagenomic

increased the number of MAGS 4-fold and increased the size of most MAGs compared to

standard metagenomics. Furthermore, MAGs containing these genes (n=55) were not predicted

to be engrafted. This reflects the incomplete nature of MAGs and the challenges of establishing

the thresholds set for presence and absence of features (**Supp Figure 1**).

Using a gene-centric methodology we identified specific sets of genes uniquely present in

patients who responded to FMT treatment. Many of these genes are involved in diverse microbial

metabolic pathways. However, a main challenge in interpreting these results arises from the

limited annotations available in existing databases, and a significant proportion of the predicted

genes (~25%) have no predicted function. Our study was limited by small number of subjects and

responders in our trial. Despite these limitations, when examining these commonly engrafted

genes with a larger cohort of IBD patients, we found that they were consistently depleted,

suggesting a possible protective or beneficial role for these genes that is disrupted in this disease

state.

Our analysis revealed a notable pattern of strain specificity among these genes, particularly in

species within the *Lachnospiraceae* and *Ruminococcaceae* families. This specificity suggests that

certain strains of these species may be important for achieving the desired therapeutic outcomes

of FMT. Conversely, in the *Bacteroides* genus, we observed that these genes are not confined to

strains of specific species but are rather widespread across the genus (**Figure 5**). As might be

predicted from this distribution, there is relatively low level of prediction for *Bacteroides* MAG

engraftment (**Figure 3**). This distribution pattern could indicate a broader functional role for

these genes within the *Bacteroides*, or may be reflective of an accessory genome that is more

widely shared across the family.

Strain level engraftment may also reflect direct strain-strain competition where donor strains

that are more adept at outcompeting a patient's own strains that may be independent of

response to FMT. However, we do find specific donor genes engrafted in multiple responders,

and also show these genes are depleted in stool metagenomic samples from ulcerative colitis

and Crohn's disease patients compared to healthy controls (**Figure 5C,D**). These observations

provide support for a role of these genes in response to FMT.

The differential distribution of engrafted genes between taxa such as *Lachnospiraceae*,

Ruminococcaceae, and *Bacteroides* underscores the complex interplay of microbial dynamics in

FMT. It highlights the importance of understanding specific microbial contributions to host

health, which can lead to more targeted and effective microbial therapies. A consortium of

strains defined by gene-level engraftment might be more effective as a FMT alternative than a

consortia based only on species considerations. By focusing on these key microbial players and

their functional genes, and investigating their roles in health and disease, we can begin to piece

together the intricate mechanisms through which the microbiota exerts their beneficial effects,

paving the way for refined FMT strategies tailored to individual microbial compositions.

430
431

Methods

Study design and sample collection.

436 The study design and sample collection was as described previously[5]. Briefly, 70 active UC
437 patients (Mayo score >=4 with an endoscopic Mayo score >=1) were randomly assigned to either
438 6 weeks of FMT (once per week; 50 mL, via enema, from healthy anonymous donor) or placebo
439 (once per week; 50 mL water enema) in a double-blind randomized controlled trial. Stool samples
440 were collected at baseline (before treatment), and during each week of the trial.

DNA extraction and 16S rRNA gene sequencing

Genomic DNA extraction and PCR amplification of the V3 region of 16S rRNA gene was conducted
using previously described protocols[5,40,41]. Briefly, 0.2 g of fecal matter was mechanically
homogenized using ceramic beads in 800 μL of 200 mM NaPO 4 (pH 8) and 100 μL of guanidine
thiocyanate-EDTA-N-lauroyl sacosine. This was followed by enzymatic lysis of the supernatant
using 50 μL of 100 mg/mL lysozyme, 50 μL of 10 U/μL mutanolysin, and 10 μL of 10 mg/mL RNase
A for one hour at 37 °C. Then, 25 μL of 25% sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS), 25μL of 20 mg/mL
proteinase K, and 75 μL of 5 M NaCl was added, and incubated for one hour at 65 ºC.
Supernatants were collected and purified through the addition of phenolchloroform-isoamyl
alcohol (25:24:1; Sigma, St. Louis, MO, USA). DNA was recovered using the DNA Clean &
Concentrator TM -25 columns, as per manufacturer's instructions (Zymo, Irvine, CA, USA) and
quantified using the NanoDrop (Thermofisher, Burlington, ON). After genomic DNA extraction,
the V3 region of the 16S rRNA gene was amplified via PCR using these conditions per reaction
well: Total polymerase chain reaction volume of 50 μL (5 μL of 10X buffer, 1.5 μL of 50mM MgCl
2 , 1 μL of 10 mM dNTPs, 2 μL of 10mg/mL BSA, 5 μL of 1 μM of each primer, 0.25 μL of Taq
polymerase (1.25U/ μL), and 30.25 μL of dH 2 O. Each reaction was divided into triplicate for
greater efficiency. The primers used in this study were developed by Bartram et al.,2011. PCR
conditions used included an initial denaturation at 94 ºC for 2 minutes, followed by 30 cycles of
94 ºC for 30s, 50 ºC for 30s, 72 ºC for 30s, followed by a final elongation at 72 ºC for 10 minutes.
All samples were sequenced using an Illumina MiSeq platform at the McMaster Genomics Facility
(Hamilton, Ontario, Canada). Samples were processed in batches, meaning not all samples were
extracted and sequenced at the same time.

16S rRNA gene sequencing processing pipeline

Cutadapt[42] v1.14 was used to filter and trim adapter sequences and PCR primers from the raw reads, using a quality score cut-off of 30 and a minimum read length of 100 bp. We used DADA2[28] v1.14.0 to resolve the sequence variants from the trimmed raw reads as follow. DNA sequences were trimmed and filtered based on the quality of the reads for each Illumina run separately. The Illumina sequencing error rates were detected, and sequences were denoised to produce ASV count table. The sequence variant tables from the different Illumina runs were merged to produce a single ASV table. Chimeras were removed and taxonomy was assigned using the DADA2 implementation of the RDP classifier against the SILVA database[43] v1.3.2, at 50% bootstrap confidence.

The ASV, taxonomy, and clinical tables were all merged into one data object in R v4.2.0 using Phyloseq v1.40.0 package[44].

Library preparation for shotgun metagenomic sequencing.

We conducted direct shotgun metagenomic sequencing on 48 samples collected from 24 patients (12 patients who received FMT (6 responders and 6 non-responders) and 12 who received placebo (both responders and 10 non-responders)), at 2 time points each (baseline and 6 weeks after treatment), as well as 4 samples from Donor B. Genomic DNA was standardized to 5 ng/µL and sonicated to 500 bp. Using the NEBNext Multiplex Oligos for Illumina kit (New England Biolabs), DNA ends were blunted, adapter ligated, PCR amplified, and cleaned as per manufacturer's instructions. Library preparations were sent to the McMaster Genome Facility and sequenced using the Illumina HiSeq platform, with a mean depth of approximately 18 million paired-end reads per sample.

Culture-enriched and independent metagenomics on Donor B samples

A fresh, anaerobic fecal sample was collected from Donor B. The collected sample was cultured using 33 different media, and incubation of plates anaerobically and aerobically resulted in 66 culture conditions for culture-enriched molecular profiling using a previously described protocol[22]. The list of media and culture conditions are described therein. 16S rRNA gene amplicon sequencing was conducted on plate pools of all 66 culture conditions. To determine a subset of plates that adequately represent the sample, the distribution of ASVs in the direct sequencing was compared to the culture-enriched sequencing using the PLCA algorithm[25]. Shotgun metagenomics was conducted on the 13 plate pools identified by the PLCA algorithm as representing the community. Genomic DNA was isolated from the all 13 selected plate pools and shotgun metagenomics conducted as previously described, with a mean depth of approximately 14 million paired-end reads per plate pool. Direct shotgun metagenomics was also conducted on the same fecal sample directly.

Comparison of the culture-enriched metagenomics with direct metagenomics data

To build a culture-enriched metagenomic library, raw shotgun sequences from the selected plate pools and the original fecal sample collected from Donor B for culturing were co-assembled as follows: Low-quality reads and sequencing primers were removed using Trimmomatic[45] v0.38 with 'LEADING:3 TRAILING:3 SLIDINGWINDOW:4:15 MINLEN:36' option. The reads were decontaminated for any human DNA using DeconSeq[46] v0.4.3. These cleaned reads were then co-assembled using metaSPAde[47] v3.10.1. Filtered raw reads were mapped to contigs (minimum length of 2.5 kb) using BWA-mem[48] v0.7.17, and then binned with Metabat2[49] v2021. This was done for both the CEMG assembly and direct metagenomic sequencing (DMG) reads from the fecal sample, using identical methods. These datasets are referred to as CEMG and DMG, respectively.

The microbial compositions of DMG and CEMG datasets were then comprehensively evaluated using the following procedure: The single-copy core genes were identified within each bin using CheckM[50] v1.1.2, any bin with minimum 70% completion and maximum 10% contamination was defined as a metagenome assembled genome (MAG). The shotgun reads were mapped to the assembled contigs to estimate sequence coverage for all contigs, Bins, and MAGs. We used BWA-mem[48] to map reads to assembled contigs and the anvio pipeline[51] to normalize the coverage to depth of sequencing. Detection values were calculated for each bin using anvio[51]. A detection value is defined as the proportion of a given MAG that is covered by at least one read; in other words, it estimates the proportion of MAG that recruited reads to it.

For taxonomic assignment of the metagenome-assembled genomes (MAGs), we utilized GTDB-Tk[52] v202.0. We built a maximum-likelihood phylogenetic tree using the aligned protein sequences from GTDB with FastTree[53]. To compare the lengths of MAGs in DMG and CEMG, we selected MAGs based on their proximity in the phylogenetic tree. The total assembly length was determined by summing contig lengths, calculated with metaSPADE, in R. All figures were created and visualized using R version 4.0.3.

Shotgun metagenomic sequencing processing pipeline

Raw reads were filtered to remove low-quality sequences and decontaminate human-derived reads using KneadData. These filtered reads were then analyzed to identify species- and strain-level markers with MetaPhlAn4 and StrainPhlAn4, respectively. To profile the relative abundance of species, MetaPhlAn4[29] v4.0.4 was employed with the '-t rel_ab' option. Similarly, for strain tracking, the '-t marker_ab_table' option was used, alongside the '--nreads' parameter to specify the number of metagenomic reads. A default minimum Reads Per Kilobase (RPK) of 1 was used to identify a marker as present.

Filtered metagenomic reads from donor samples (n=4) and culture-enriched plate pools (n=13) were co-assembled using metaSPAdes[47] v3.10.1 to create a comprehensive Donor B database.

Contigs of at least 2.5 kb were annotated with Bakta[54] v1.5.0 to identify genes. These annotated
contigs were then binned with Metabat2[49] v2021, leveraging mapping data from all plate pools
and Donor B samples. The quality of the resulting bins was evaluated using CheckM[50] v1.1.2; bins
with a completion rate of at least 70% and contamination of 10% or less were designated as
metagenome-assembled genomes (MAGs). Taxonomic classification of MAGs was performed
using GTDB-Tk[52] v202.0.

All patient metagenomic samples (n=48) were normalized to the lowest sequencing depth
observed in the dataset (5.5 million paired-end reads) using seqtk[55] v1.1.0 for random
subsampling. These rarefied reads were mapped to the genes and contigs assembled from Donor
B using BWA-mem[48] v0.7.17, applying perfect match filtering options '-O 60 -E 10 -L 100'.
Coverage information at 1x was calculated using samtools[56] 'coverage'.

A database of 33,167 RefSeq bacterial genomes, categorized as 'assembly-level complete' and
downloaded as of May 2023, was compiled using a custom Python script. We identified a unique
set of genes present exclusively in responder patients and used these as query sequences for
BLAST searches against this database, employing BLAST[57] v2.13.0+. Hits were selected based on
stringent criteria: percent identity of at least 90%, query coverage of at least 90%, and gene
lengths of 100 base pairs or more. Genomes containing at least five such genes were visualized.
The taxonomy of these genomes was determined using GTDB-Tk[52] v202.0. To functionally
annotate these genes, they were clustered at 90% protein identity using MMseqs2[58] v13.45111
and then profiled against KEGG, COG, and PFAM databases using eggNOG-mapper[59] v 2.1.7 and
database version of 5.0.2.

Additionally, a publicly available metagenomic dataset (PRJNA40007229[33]), comprising samples
from 56 healthy subjects, 76 patients with ulcerative colitis (UC), and 88 patients with Crohn's
disease (CD), was downloaded from the Sequence Read Archive (SRA). These samples were
mapped to the identified gene set using BWA-mem[48] v0.7.17, applying strict matching filters ('-O
60 -E 10 -L 100'). samtools[56] 'coverage' was then used to quantify the presence of these genes in
each sample and to calculate the percentage of reads mapped to these genes per sample.

Feature Types

As described above, we used the 16S and shotgun metagenomic reads from our samples to
generate five datasets, each consisting of a single feature type: 16S rRNA gene amplicon ASVs,
species, strains, MAGs, and genes. The 16S ASVs are the only feature type that was generated
using amplicon-based methods. The rest were based on the shotgun metagenomic reads. Within
these remaining four, species and strains were read-based methods because they did not require
assembly, while MAGs and genes were assembly-based, since they used contigs of assembled
reads. We analyzed all five feature types to determine which method allowed us to minimize the
spurious appearance of engraftment, while still having the sensitivity to detect true engraftment
that may be happening.

Assessing Engraftment

In order for us to call a feature "apparently engrafted", it needed to meet three criteria: 1. It must
be observed in the Donor B samples. 2. It must be absent from the patient's pre-treatment
sample. 3. It must be present in the patient's post-treatment sample.

For all feature types, criterion 1 was met if the feature was observed at least once in any Donor
B sample. The definitions of criteria 2 and 3 (absence and presence) depended on feature type.
Our aim was to be quite strict with these criteria in order to minimize spurious identification of
engraftment.

For the 16S ASV, strain, and species feature types, a feature was deemed to be absent at baseline
(criterion 2) if the patient's pre-treatment sample contained that feature exactly 0 times. Even a
single read assigned to a given feature in a baseline sample would remove it from consideration
for engraftment in that patient. Criterion 3 (presence after treatment) was met if the feature's
relative abundance in the post-treatment sample surpassed a given threshold. The threshold
varied between the three feature types, and in each case was chosen such that, when it was
applied to Donor B's own samples, it eliminated the bottom 20% of features from the merged
datasets. The cutoffs were 1.3e04 for 16S ASVs and strains, and 0.0072 for species. **Supp Figure**
1 shows the presence vs. relative abundance histograms used to determine these cutoffs.

For assembly-based feature types (genes and MAGs), presence and absence were determined by
1x coverage, rather than abundance. In order to identify reasonable cutoffs for MAGs, we
mapped Donor B's reads back to the database of Donor B assemblies, and then created a
histogram showing the frequencies with which MAGs were covered at least 1x over different
proportions of their length. We observed a u-shape in this histogram, where approximately 50%
of the MAGs in each sample were covered 1x over at least 75% of their length, most intermediate
values of coverage were present at very low frequency, and there was another peak of varying
height starting at 1x coverage over less than 20% of the MAG's length. We reason that MAGs that
were present in a given sample are represented by the peak above 75% coverage, while MAGs
that are absent from that sample can be seen in the lower peak. We called a MAG absent in a
baseline sample if it was covered at least 1x over less than 20% of its length, and present in a
post-treatment sample if it was covered at least 1x over at least 75% of its length. For genes, we
used a 25% coverage criterion to define a gene as absent, and required its 1x coverage to be over
at least 90% of its length in order to call it present after treatment. Both cutoffs were raised
relative to the MAG cutoffs to allow for the fact that different genes which happen to share
similar motifs can have quite similar DNA sequences over a substantial proportion of their
lengths.

Within each patient, any features that failed to meet even one of the three criteria were removed
from consideration for engraftment.

Once apparently engrafted features were identified in all samples across all feature types, we
sought to test whether patients who received FMT had higher levels of apparent engraftment
than those who received placebo treatment. We constructed three test statistics, all of which we
tested using the same permutation test. These three test statistics were the differences between
FMT and placebo groups in: 1. the number of features engrafted at least once in the given
treatment group (T_1), 2. the number of engraftment events in that occurred in each treatment
group (i.e. the count of engrafted features, weighted by the number of patients each feature was
engrafted in) (T_2), and 3. the number of engraftment events weighted by the number of patients
each event occurred in (.e. the count of engrafted features, weighted by the square of the
number of patients each feature was engrafted in) (T_3). The reason for this third test statistic was
that we reasoned that a feature that appears engrafted in multiple patients is less likely to have
been a spurious signal of engraftment, and so we wanted to up-weight those features based on
the number of individuals they were engrafted in. Looking at the graphs in **Figure 2 (A1, B1, C1),**
4(A1), and 5(A1), the test statistics can be calculated as follows, where x is the number of patients
a feature is engrafted in, and f(x) is the number of features engrafted in exactly that many
patients:

658
$$T_1 = \sum \left(f_{FMT}(x) - f_{placebo}(x) \right)$$
659   (1)

660
$$T_2 = \sum x \left(f_{FMT}(x) - f_{placebo}(x) \right)$$
661   (2)

662
$$T_3 = \sum x^2 \left(f_{FMT}(x) - f_{placebo}(x) \right)$$
(3)

Permutation tests were conducted by permuting the group membership of each patient 1,999
times, and for each permutation calculating the number of engrafted features, engraftment
events, and weighted engraftment events in each group, and taking their difference. The 2,000th
value in each permuted null distribution was the observed value. Two-tailed p-values were
calculated by finding the quantile of the observed test statistic in the null distribution, taking its
distance from 0 or 1, whichever was smaller, and doubling that value. This same method was
used to compare the amounts of apparent engraftment in responder- vs. non-responder-patients
within the FMT treatment group **(Figure 2(A3, B3, C3), 4(A3), and 5(A3))**.

Once count tables or coverage values had been calculated for a given feature type, all data
organization and analysis code were written in R v4.2.0 using the tidyverse[60] collection of
packages. Figures were generated in R using ggplot2 and tidytext and refined in Inkscape. R
scripts are available at https://github.com/SShekarriz/UCFMT1.

Acknowledgements
679
This work was supported by grants from Crohn's Colitis Canada, and the Inflammation,
Microbiome, and Alimentation: Gastrointestinal and Neuropsychiatric Effects (IMAGINE)
Network CIHR grant. M.G.S. is supported by a Canada Research Chair. During some of this work
S.S. was supported by Mitacs Elevate Fellowship and F.J. Whelan was supported by an Anne
McLaren Fellow funded by the University of Nottingham and a Marie Skłodowska-Curie Individual
Fellowship (grant agreement number 793818). The authors would like to thank Dr. Ben Bolker
and the McMaster biodata lunch group, as well as Dr. Kevin Purbhoo, for their valuable insight
and suggestions in the development of our statistical methods.

688
689
690

Supplementary Results

Culture-enriched metagenomics improves the quality of de novo assembly and taxonomic
binning.

It is often challenging to determine if the donor is responsible for the observed microbial changes
after FMT or if they instead represent population restructuring within the patient's own
microbiota. Assembly-based metagenomic approaches provide better resolution, and may be
more suitable than amplicon- or read-based metagenomic techniques for tracking strain- or
gene-level changes. However, the quality of genome assembly and taxonomic binning of
metagenomic assemblies can be poor[56] and recovering low-abundance taxa is challenging[37].
Previous studies have shown that the human microbiota is culturable[22,24,25,38], and that a
combination of direct (culture-independent) sequencing and sequencing after comprehensive
culturing can result in increased observed microbial diversity[22,25,39].

We hypothesized that co-assembling sequences from direct and culture-enriched metagenomic
sequencing (CEMG) of the Donor B microbiota would improve gene and metagenome assembled
genome (MAG) recovery from this donor compared to the commonly used direct metagenomic
(DMG) approach. To test this hypothesis, we conducted shotgun metagenomic sequencing on a
previously cultured[22] fecal sample from Donor B (**Figure 1**). We then compared the assemblies
and microbial binning qualities achieved from DMG vs CEMG sequencing for this single fecal
sample.

DMG resulted in 35,577 assembled contigs (> 2.5 Kb) accounting for ~340 Mb of the assembled
sequences, whereas the same number of contigs in CEMG captured ~620 Mb. In addition to
providing more contigs, the CEMG method produced longer contigs, specifically (**Supp Figure 2A**).
These longer contigs enhanced gene predictions and generated more (132 vs. 49) metagenome-
assembled genomes (MAGs; > 70% complete and < 10% contamination; see Methods). To assess
the specificity of the two approaches, we mapped raw reads from both DMG and CEMG to the

assembled MAGs from both assemblies. CEMG provided 83 more MAGs than DMG; however,
most of these additional MAGs were well covered by the DMG reads, indicating that their
presence is not due to contamination, but instead increased representation in the sequencing
(**Supp Figure 2B**). The additional MAGs from CEMG sequencing are not derived from any
particular taxonomic groups, but instead represent multiple families in proportion to their
abundance in the DMG approach (**Supp Figure 2B, C**).
726
To examine the quality of assembled MAGs, we selected 40 homologous MAGs from the DMG
and CEMG assemblies based on their position in a maximum-likelihood phylogenetic tree of core
genome alignment (data not shown), and compared their genome sizes. We found that 24 out of
the 40 MAGs (60%) were longer in the CEMG assemblies than in DMG (**Supp Figure 2D**). We
concluded that CEMG sequencing enhances the assembly of genes and MAGs for intestinal
microbiota and set to use this approach to investigate microbial engraftment following FMT.
733
734

736
737

738
739
740
Supp Figure 1. **Profiles of features in Donor B samples, for determining engraftment cutoffs.** *Panels (A – D)1 show the*
proportion of unique features retained (y-axis) after all features below a given cutoff (x-axis) are removed. In panels A (16S
ASVs), B (species markers), and C (strain markers), the cutoffs are relative abundances. In panel D (MAGs), the cutoffs are the
proportion of the genome covered by at least one read. Panels (A – D)2 are histograms of the frequencies of various relative
abundances (A – C) or 1x coverages (D). Vertical black lines in A2, B2, and C2 show our chosen cutoffs to define a feature as
present, in both cases removing the bottom 20% of the density of the histogram. Vertical black lines in D2 show our chosen
cutoffs for both absence and presence, removing the distributions' two peaks as described in the Methods section.

Supp Figure 2 **Comparison of culture enriched (CEMG) and direct metagenomics (DMG) for Donor B. A.** The cumulative lengths
of assembled contigs >2.5 kb for all contigs, and for contigs belonging to MAGs. Vertical dashed line represents the number of
contigs in the DMG assembly, horizontal lines represent the total assembly size at that number of contigs for DMG and CEMG
respectively. B. DMG and CEMG read mapping coverage (mean MAG coverage at least 1X) of the MAGs (n=49) assembled via
DMG. The top colour bar shows the family-level taxonomy of the MAGs. C. CEMG and DMG read mapping coverage for the MAGs
(n=132) assembled via CEMG. D. Genome sizes among homologous MAGs in CEMG and DMG.

759
Supp Figure 3 **Proportion of Donor B's features that are engrafted, shared between donor and recipient, or only found in donor.**
Panels A(1 – 3) concern the ASV feature type, panels B(1 – 3) concern the strain feature type, panels C(1 – 3) concern the species
feature type, panels D(1 – 3) concern the MAG feature type, and panels E(1 – 3) concern the gene feature type. Panels (A – E)1:
For each patient, we calculated the proportion of Donor B features of a given feature type that were absent (as defined by the
absence cutoff of our engraftment criteria) from both the pre- and post-treatment samples (light blue: Donor), were already
present (as defined by our presence cutoff ditto) in the pre-treatment sample (dark blue: Shared), met the criteria for engraftment
(dark green: Engraft), or did not meet any of these criteria (light green: Other). In almost every case, the majority of Donor B's
features were absent from the patient, and the 'Other' category contained the fewest features. Panels (A – E)2: the mean values
of the categories in (A – E)1 across all patients within a given feature type. Again showing that, within any individual patient,
most Donor B features are absent from that patient at all times. Panels (A – E)3: Taking all patients in a given treatment arm (FMT
or Placebo) together, features are counted in the light blue (Donor) category if they are absent from both timepoint samples from
all patients. Features are counted in the Shared (dark blue) and Engraft (dark green) categories if they meet the corresponding
above-define criteria in **any** patient (meaning some features may be counted in both categories). Features that do not meet any
of the above criteria are included in the Other (light green) bar. In all cases, the Donor category contains more features in the
Placebo group than the FMT group; however, the gene feature type shows the largest proportional difference. In all cases, the

FMT group includes more Engraft features than the Placebo group. The MAG and gene features types show the largest
proportional difference.

777
778

Supplementary Tables

Supplementary Table 1: Permutation-test p-values for all three test statistics.[1]

Feature Type	Test	T_1 p-value	T_2 p-value	T_3 p-value
16S	FMT vs Placebo	<0.0005	<0.0005	<0.0005
	Responders vs Non	0.961	0.957	0.996
species	FMT vs Placebo	0.025	0.021	0.014
	Responders vs Non	0.323	0.336	0.357
strain	FMT vs Placebo	0.01	0.005	0.005
	Responders vs Non	0.296	0.29	0.296
MAG	FMT vs Placebo	0.007	0.01	0.008
	Responders vs Non	0.176	0.189	0.239
gene	FMT vs Placebo	0.001	0.001	0.001
	Responders vs Non	0.87	0.879	0.877

[1] P-values for the three test statistics were not identical within each dataset, but were similar. P-values < 0.05 are highlighted in blue. All the FMT vs. Placebo tests were statistically significant, while none of the FMT Responder vs. Non-Responder tests were. In only one case (highlighted in yellow) was the observed value less than the median of the null distribution

Supplementary Table 2: Number of features apparently engrafted, by number of patients that feature was engrafted in for each type of analysis.

Feature Type	Condition	# Patients	Feature Count
16S	Placebo	1	81
		2	35
		3	29
		4	11
		5	4
		6	3
		7	1
		8	0
		9	0
		10	1
	FMT (all)	1	109
		2	79
		3	40
		4	25
		5	10
		6	2
		7	0

			8	1
			9	0
			10	0
		FMT (responder)	1	118
			2	57
			3	33
			4	9
			5	3
			6	0
			7	1
		FMT (non-responder)	1	96
			2	33
			3	2
			4	0
			5	0
			6	0
			7	0
species		Placebo	1	80
			2	14
			3	3
			4	0
			5	0
		FMT (all)	1	158
			2	63
			3	24
			4	2
			5	5
		FMT (responder)	1	146
			2	49
			3	5
		FMT (non-responder)	1	90
			2	14
			3	4
strain		Placebo	1	13,080
			2	3,338
			3	750
			4	148
			5	20
			6	1
			7	0
			8	0

	FMT (all)	1	23,093
		2	10,316
		3	4,008
		4	1,229
		5	433
		6	129
		7	29
		8	1
	FMT (responder)	1	21,322
		2	7,281
		3	1,438
		4	162
	FMT (non-responder)	1	14,737
		2	3,084
		3	620
		4	51
MAG	Placebo	1	14
		2	2
		3	0
		4	0
		5	0
	FMT (all)	1	45
		2	17
		3	3
		4	0
		5	1
	FMT (responder)	1	39
		2	15
		3	1
	FMT (non-responder)	1	18
		2	0
		3	1
gene	Placebo	1	83,282
		2	11,775
		3	1,472
		4	142
		5	9
		6	0
		7	0
		8	0
	FMT (all)	1	218,257

		2	67,350
		3	18,043
		4	5,511
		5	713
		6	91
		7	11
		8	1
	FMT (responder)	1	176,849
		2	47,623
		3	3,766
		4	258
		5	5
	FMT (non-responder)	1	110,286
		2	16,322
		3	1,873
		4	78
		5	3

791 **Supplementary Table 3: The number of features apparently engrafted uniquely in FMT or**
792 **Placebo groups, or in both, by the total number of patients they appeared to be engrafted in**

Feature Type	Group Engrafted	Total Patients	Count
16S	FMT Only	1	73
		2	42
		3	18
		4	9
		5	4
	Placebo Only	1	31
		2	8
		3	4
		4	2
	Both	2	18
		3	20
		4	28
		5	19
		6	18
		7	5
		8	5
		9	3
		10	2
		12	1

		15	1
species	FMT Only	1	123
		2	48
		3	16
	Placebo Only	1	25
		2	6
		3	1
	Both	2	28
		3	20
		4	8
		5	4
		6	4
		7	1
strain	FMT Only	1	16,872
		2	6,594
		3	2,343
		4	552
		5	138
		6	67
		7	20
		8	1
	Placebo Only	1	3,589
		2	865
		3	193
		4	33
		5	6
	Both	2	4,618
		3	4,053
		4	2,245
		5	1,078
		6	474
		7	154
		8	26
		9	3
MAG	FMT Only	1	39
		2	16
		3	3
	Placebo Only	1	7
		2	1
	Both	2	5
		3	2

gene		6	1
	FMT Only	1	188,238
		2	50,809
		3	13,761
		4	4,654
		5	519
		6	61
		7	6
	Placebo Only	1	39,487
		2	4,672
		3	555
		4	35
		5	2
	Both	2	26,103
		3	16,986
		4	6,366
		5	1,858
		6	485
		7	95
		8	34
		9	2

793
794

References:

1. Kappelman, M. D. *et al.* The prevalence and geographic distribution of Crohn's disease and ulcerative colitis in the United States. *Clin. Gastroenterol. Hepatol. Off. Clin. Pract. J. Am. Gastroenterol. Assoc.* **5**, 1424–1429 (2007).

2. de Souza, H. S. P. & Fiocchi, C. Immunopathogenesis of IBD: current state of the art. *Nat. Rev. Gastroenterol. Hepatol.* **13**, 13–27 (2016).

3. Hindryckx, P., Jairath, V. & D'Haens, G. Acute severe ulcerative colitis: from pathophysiology to clinical management. *Nat. Rev. Gastroenterol. Hepatol.* **13**, 654–664 (2016).

4. Talley, N. J. *et al.* An evidence-based systematic review on medical therapies for inflammatory bowel disease. *Am. J. Gastroenterol.* **106 Suppl 1**, S2-25; quiz S26 (2011).

5. Moayyedi, P. *et al.* Fecal Microbiota Transplantation Induces Remission in Patients With Active Ulcerative Colitis in a Randomized Controlled Trial. *Gastroenterology* **149**, 102-109.e6 (2015).

6. Peery, A. F. *et al.* AGA Clinical Practice Guideline on Fecal Microbiota-Based Therapies for Select Gastrointestinal Diseases. *Gastroenterology* **166**, 409–434 (2024).

7. Khoruts, A., Staley, C. & Sadowsky, M. J. Faecal microbiota transplantation for Clostridioides difficile: mechanisms and pharmacology. *Nat. Rev. Gastroenterol. Hepatol.* **18**, 67–80 (2021).

8. Khanna, S., Shin, A. & Kelly, C. P. Management of Clostridium difficile Infection in Inflammatory Bowel Disease: Expert Review from the Clinical Practice Updates Committee of the AGA Institute. *Clin. Gastroenterol. Hepatol. Off. Clin. Pract. J. Am. Gastroenterol. Assoc.* **15**, 166–174 (2017).

9. Feng, J. *et al.* Efficacy and safety of fecal microbiota transplantation in the treatment of

ulcerative colitis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sci. Rep.* **13**, 14494 (2023).

10.   Pai, N. *et al.* Results of the First Pilot Randomized Controlled Trial of Fecal Microbiota

Transplant In Pediatric Ulcerative Colitis: Lessons, Limitations, and Future Prospects.

Gastroenterology **161**, 388-393.e3 (2021).

11.   Narula, N. *et al.* Systematic Review and Meta-analysis: Fecal Microbiota Transplantation

for Treatment of Active Ulcerative Colitis. *Inflamm. Bowel Dis.* **23**, 1702–1709 (2017).

12.   Jaramillo, A. P. *et al.* Effectiveness of Fecal Microbiota Transplantation Treatment in

Patients With Recurrent Clostridium difficile Infection, Ulcerative Colitis, and Crohn's

Disease: A Systematic Review. *Cureus* **15**, e42120 (2023).

13.   Liu, H., Li, J., Yuan, J., Huang, J. & Xu, Y. Fecal microbiota transplantation as a therapy for

treating ulcerative colitis: an overview of systematic reviews. *BMC Microbiol.* **23**, 371 (2023).

14.   Smillie, C. S. *et al.* Strain Tracking Reveals the Determinants of Bacterial Engraftment in

the Human Gut Following Fecal Microbiota Transplantation. *Cell Host Microbe* **23**, 229-

240.e5 (2018).

15.   Staley, C. *et al.* Durable Long-Term Bacterial Engraftment following Encapsulated Fecal

Microbiota Transplantation To Treat Clostridium difficile Infection. *mBio* **10**,

10.1128/mbio.01586-19 (2019).

16.   Aggarwala, V. *et al.* Precise quantification of bacterial strains after fecal microbiota

transplantation delineates long-term engraftment and explains outcomes. *Nat. Microbiol.* **6**,

1309–1318 (2021).

17.   Deng, Z.-L. *et al.* Engraftment of essential functions through multiple fecal microbiota

transplants in chronic antibiotic-resistant pouchitis—a case study using metatranscriptomics.

Microbiome **11**, 269 (2023).

18.   Wilson, B. C. *et al.* Strain engraftment competition and functional augmentation in a

multi-donor fecal microbiota transplantation trial for obesity. *Microbiome* **9**, 107 (2021).

19.   Podlesny, D. *et al.* Identification of clinical and ecological determinants of strain

engraftment after fecal microbiota transplantation using metagenomics. *Cell Rep. Med.* **3**,

100711 (2022).

20.   Ianiro, G. *et al.* Variability of strain engraftment and predictability of microbiome

composition after fecal microbiota transplantation across different diseases. *Nat. Med.* **28**,

1913–1923 (2022).

21.   Schmidt, T. S. B. *et al.* Drivers and determinants of strain dynamics following fecal

microbiota transplantation. *Nat. Med.* **28**, 1902–1912 (2022).

22.   Lau, J. T. *et al.* Capturing the diversity of the human gut microbiota through culture-

enriched molecular profiling. *Genome Med.* **8**, 72 (2016).

23.   Browne, H. P. *et al.* Culturing of 'unculturable' human microbiota reveals novel taxa and

extensive sporulation. *Nature* **533**, 543–546 (2016).

24.   Sibley, C. D. *et al.* Culture Enriched Molecular Profiling of the Cystic Fibrosis Airway

Microbiome. *PLOS ONE* **6**, e22702 (2011).

25.   Whelan, F. J. *et al.* Culture-enriched metagenomic sequencing enables in-depth profiling

of the cystic fibrosis lung microbiota. *Nat. Microbiol.* **5**, 379–390 (2020).

26.   Myles, I. A. *et al.* A method for culturing Gram-negative skin microbiota. *BMC Microbiol.*

16, 60 (2016).

27.   Hilt, E. E. *et al.* Urine Is Not Sterile: Use of Enhanced Urine Culture Techniques To Detect

Resident Bacterial Flora in the Adult Female Bladder. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **52**, 871–876 (2014).

28.   Callahan, B. J. *et al.* DADA2: High-resolution sample inference from Illumina amplicon

data. *Nat. Methods* **13**, 581–583 (2016).

29.   Blanco-Míguez, A. *et al.* Extending and improving metagenomic taxonomic profiling with

uncharacterized species using MetaPhlAn 4. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **41**, 1633–1644 (2023).

30.   Karcher, N. *et al.* Genomic diversity and ecology of human-associated Akkermansia

species in the gut microbiome revealed by extensive metagenomic assembly. *Genome Biol.*

22, 209 (2021).

31.   Rousset, F. *et al.* Publisher Correction: The impact of genetic diversity on gene

essentiality within the Escherichia coli species. *Nat. Microbiol.* **6**, 700–700 (2021).

32.   Meziti, A. *et al.* The Reliability of Metagenome-Assembled Genomes (MAGs) in

Representing Natural Populations: Insights from Comparing MAGs against Isolate Genomes

Derived from the Same Fecal Sample. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **87**, e02593-20 (2021).

33.   Franzosa, E. A. *et al.* Gut microbiome structure and metabolic activity in inflammatory

bowel disease. *Nat. Microbiol.* **4**, 293–305 (2019).

34.   Montrose, J. A., Kurada, S. & Fischer, M. Current and future microbiome-based

therapies in inflammatory bowel disease. *Curr. Opin. Gastroenterol.*

10.1097/MOG.0000000000001027 doi:10.1097/MOG.0000000000001027.

35.   Costello, S. P. *et al.* Effect of Fecal Microbiota Transplantation on 8-Week Remission in

Patients With Ulcerative Colitis: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* **321**, 156–164 (2019).

36.   Sieber, C. M. K. *et al.* Recovery of genomes from metagenomes via a dereplication,

aggregation and scoring strategy. *Nat. Microbiol.* **3**, 836–843 (2018).

37.   Sczyrba, A. *et al.* Critical Assessment of Metagenome Interpretation-a benchmark of

metagenomics software. *Nat. Methods* **14**, 1063–1071 (2017).

38.   Lewis, W. H., Tahon, G., Geesink, P., Sousa, D. Z. & Ettema, T. J. G. Innovations to

culturing the uncultured microbial majority. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **19**, 225–240 (2021).

39.   Forster, S. C. *et al.* A human gut bacterial genome and culture collection for improved

metagenomic analyses. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **37**, 186–192 (2019).

40.   Whelan, F. J. *et al.* The loss of topography in the microbial communities of the upper

respiratory tract in the elderly. *Ann. Am. Thorac. Soc.* **11**, 513–521 (2014).

41.   Bartram, A. K., Lynch, M. D. J., Stearns, J. C., Moreno-Hagelsieb, G. & Neufeld, J. D.

Generation of multimillion-sequence 16S rRNA gene libraries from complex microbial

communities by assembling paired-end illumina reads. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **77**, 3846–

3852 (2011).

42.   Martin, M. Cutadapt removes adapter sequences from high-throughput sequencing

reads. *EMBnet.journal* **17**, 10–12 (2011).

43.   Quast, C. *et al.* The SILVA ribosomal RNA gene database project: improved data

processing and web-based tools. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **41**, D590–D596 (2013).

44.   McMurdie, P. J. & Holmes, S. phyloseq: An R Package for Reproducible Interactive

Analysis and Graphics of Microbiome Census Data. *PLOS ONE* **8**, e61217 (2013).

45.   Bolger, A. M., Lohse, M. & Usadel, B. Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina

903   sequence data. *Bioinformatics* **30**, 2114–2120 (2014).

904   46.   Schmieder, R. & Edwards, R. Fast Identification and Removal of Sequence

905   Contamination from Genomic and Metagenomic Datasets. *PLOS ONE* **6**, e17288 (2011).

906   47.   Nurk, S., Meleshko, D., Korobeynikov, A. & Pevzner, P. A. metaSPAdes: a new versatile

907   metagenomic assembler. *Genome Res.* **27**, 824–834 (2017).

908   48.   Li, H. & Durbin, R. Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows–Wheeler

909   transform. *Bioinformatics* **25**, 1754–1760 (2009).

910   49.   Kang, D. D. *et al.* MetaBAT 2: an adaptive binning algorithm for robust and efficient

911   genome reconstruction from metagenome assemblies. *PeerJ* **7**, e7359 (2019).

912   50.   Parks, D. H., Imelfort, M., Skennerton, C. T., Hugenholtz, P. & Tyson, G. W. CheckM:

913   assessing the quality of microbial genomes recovered from isolates, single cells, and

914   metagenomes. *Genome Res.* **25**, 1043–1055 (2015).

915   51.   Eren, A. M. *et al.* Community-led, integrated, reproducible multi-omics with anvi'o. *Nat.*

916   *Microbiol.* **6**, 3–6 (2021).

917   52.   Chaumeil, P.-A., Mussig, A. J., Hugenholtz, P. & Parks, D. H. GTDB-Tk: a toolkit to classify

918   genomes with the Genome Taxonomy Database. *Bioinformatics* **36**, 1925–1927 (2020).

919   53.   Price, M. N., Dehal, P. S. & Arkin, A. P. FastTree 2 – Approximately Maximum-Likelihood

920   Trees for Large Alignments. *PLOS ONE* **5**, e9490 (2010).

921   54.   Schwengers, O. *et al.* Bakta: rapid and standardized annotation of bacterial genomes via

922   alignment-free sequence identification. *Microb. Genomics* **7**, 000685 (2021).

55.   Shen, W., Le, S., Li, Y. & Hu, F. SeqKit: A Cross-Platform and Ultrafast Toolkit for FASTA/Q

File Manipulation. *PLOS ONE* **11**, e0163962 (2016).

56.   Li, H. *et al.* The Sequence Alignment/Map format and SAMtools. *Bioinformatics* **25**,

2078–2079 (2009).

57.   Camacho, C. *et al.* BLAST+: architecture and applications. *BMC Bioinformatics* **10**, 421

(2009).

58.   Steinegger, M. & Söding, J. MMseqs2 enables sensitive protein sequence searching for

the analysis of massive data sets. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **35**, 1026–1028 (2017).

59.   Cantalapiedra, C. P., Hernández-Plaza, A., Letunic, I., Bork, P. & Huerta-Cepas, J.

eggNOG-mapper v2: Functional Annotation, Orthology Assignments, and Domain Prediction

at the Metagenomic Scale. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **38**, 5825–5829 (2021).

60.   Wickham, H. *et al.* Welcome to the Tidyverse. *J. Open Source Softw.* **4**, 1686 (2019).

935